



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,902	07/17/2003	David Yu Chang	AUS920030082US1	2139
65362 7590 01/23/2008 HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP IBM Austin P.O. BOX 203518 AUSTIN, TX 78720			EXAMINER CAO, PHUONG THAO	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/23/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/621,902

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong-Thao Cao

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-17 and 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In response to the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed on 9/18/2007, the finality of rejection is withdrawn.
2. This action is in response to the Amendment filed on 4/5/2007.
3. Currently, claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Custodio (Publication No US 2003/0182652, effective filing date 03/20/2002) in view of Lee et al. (US Patent No 5,745,683 issued on 04/28/1998).

As to claim 1, Custodio teaches:

"A method for processing names by a naming service within a data processing system" (see Custodio, [0008] and [0047]-[0049] wherein values of file ID, deployment ID, deployment path, and so on can be all broadly interpreted as names, and the mapping between file ID (name) and its location represents a naming service which resolves a name to its location), the method comprising:

"obtaining an application name that is associated with an application" (see Custodio, [0047] wherein a file, for instance an Enterprise Archive (EAR) file, is interpreted as an application, and file ID is broadly interpreted as application name);

"obtaining a deployment name that is associated with deployment attribute that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application" (see Custodio, [0049] for deployment ID); and

“the deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system” (see Custodio, [0047] for deployment path as deployment attribute).

Custodio teaches application name (file ID), deployment name (deployment ID) and the combination of application name and deployment name to identify an instance of the application (using file ID and deployment ID to identify a particular instance of a deployed file). However, Custodio does not explicitly teach:

“generating an application-based name for the instance of the application”;

“storing the application-based name for the instance of the application in a computer storage medium” wherein

“the application-based name represents a context within a naming system”, and

“the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the deployment name”.

On the other hand, Lee et al. teaches general concepts of a naming system including atomic names, generating compound name from atomic names and naming context within a naming system (see Lee et al., [column 7, lines 15-67] and [column 8, lines 1-40]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lee et al. into the Custodio’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Lee et al. in column 1, lines 63-67 that a Naming or Directory service is a fundamental facility in any computing system, and in column 2, lines 10-15 that a naming service is usually integrated with another service such as file system, database, desktop, etc. In addition, integrating a naming system into the database in

Custodio's system to generate application based names based on identification information in the database and representing a context within a naming system provides an effective and convenient way to manage the deployed files (applications) in environments of the system.

As to claim 9, Custodio teaches:

"An apparatus for processing names by a naming service within a data processing system" (see Custodio, [0008] and [0047]-[0049] wherein values of file ID, deployment ID, deployment path, and so on can be all broadly interpreted as names, and the mapping between file ID (name) and its location represents a naming service which resolves a name to its location), the apparatus comprising:

"means for obtaining an application name that is associated with an application" (see Custodio, [0047] wherein a file, for instance an Enterprise Archive (EAR) file, is interpreted as an application, and file ID is broadly interpreted as application name);

"means for obtaining a deployment name that is associated with deployment attribute that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application" (see Custodio, [0049] for deployment ID); and

"the deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system" (see Custodio, [0047] for deployment path as deployment attribute).

Custodio teaches application name (file ID), deployment name (deployment ID) and the combination of application name and deployment name to identify an instance of the application

(using file ID and deployment ID to identify a particular instance of a deployed file). However, Custodio does not explicitly teach:

“means for generating an application-based name for the instance of the application”;

“means for storing the application-based name for the instance of the application in a computer storage medium” wherein

“the application-based name represents a context within a naming system”, and

“the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the deployment name”.

On the other hand, Lee et al. teaches general concepts of a naming system including atomic names, generating compound name from atomic names and naming context within a naming system (see Lee et al., [column 7, lines 15-67] and [column 8, lines 1-40]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lee et al. into the Custodio's system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Lee et al. in column 1, lines 63-67 that a Naming or Directory service is a fundamental facility in any computing system, and in column 2, lines 10-15 that a naming service is usually integrated with another service such as file system, database, desktop, etc. In addition, integrating a naming system into the database in Custodio's system to generate application based names based on identification information in the database and representing a context within a naming system provides an effective and convenient way to manage the deployed files (applications) in environments of the system.

As to claim 17, Custodio teaches:

"A computer program product in a computer storage medium for use in a data processing system for processing names by a naming service" (see Custodio, [0008] and [0047]-[0049] wherein values of file ID, deployment ID, deployment path, and so on can be all broadly interpreted as names, and the mapping between file ID (name) and its location represents a naming service which resolves a name to its location), the computer program product comprising:

"means for obtaining an application name that is associated with an application" (see Custodio, [0047] wherein a file, for instance an Enterprise Archive (EAR) file, is interpreted as an application, and file ID is broadly interpreted as application name);

"means for obtaining a deployment name that is associated with deployment attribute that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application" (see Custodio, [0049] for deployment ID); and

"the deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system" (see Custodio, [0047] for deployment path as deployment attribute).

Custodio teaches application name (file ID), deployment name (deployment ID) and the combination of application name and deployment name to identify an instance of the application (using file ID and deployment ID to identify a particular instance of a deployed file). However, Custodio does not explicitly teach:

"means for generating an application-based name for the instance of the application";

"means for storing the application-based name for the instance of the application in a computer storage medium" wherein

“the application-based name represents a context within a naming system”, and

“the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the deployment name”.

On the other hand, Lee et al. teaches general concepts of a naming system including atomic names, generating compound name from atomic names and naming context within a naming system (see Lee et al., [column 7, lines 15-67] and [column 8, lines 1-40]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lee et al. into the Custodio’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Lee et al. in column 1, lines 63-67 that a Naming or Directory service is a fundamental facility in any computing system, and in column 2, lines 10-15 that a naming service is usually integrated with another service such as file system, database, desktop, etc. In addition, integrating a naming system into the database in Custodio’s system to generate application based names based on identification information in the database and representing a context within a naming system provides an effective and convenient way to manage the deployed files (applications) in environments of the system.

As to claims 3, 11 and 19, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above to rejected claims 1, 9 and 17, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Custodio and Lee et al. teach:

“wherein the application-based name comprises the application name and multiple deployment names associated with multiple deployment attributes” (see Custodio, [0062] for the combination of file ID (application name) with deployment ID and version number wherein

values of deployment ID and version number can be broadly interpreted as multiple deployment names associated with multiple deployment attributes (deployment ID, version number); see Lee et al., [column 7, lines 20-22] for compound name).

As to claims 4, 12 and 20, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above to rejected claims 1, 9 and 17, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Custodio and Lee et al. teach:

“wherein a deployment attribute is selected from the group comprising” (see Custodio, [0062]):

“a deployment identifier, wherein a deployment identifier is a unique identifier associated with the deployment operation, wherein the deployment identifier is unique over all deployment operations within the data processing system or is unique over all deployment operations for all instances of the application within the data processing system” (see Custodio, [0047] and [0049]);

“a version identifier or an edition identifier associated with a version of the application” (see Custodio, [0054] and [0062] for version number); or

“some other identifier for a deployment-associated characteristic or metric” (see Custodio, [0062] for release ID, deployment path).

As to claims 5, 13 and 21, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above to rejected claims 1, 9 and 17, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Custodio and Lee et al. teach:

“binding the application-based name to a data object” (see Lee et al., [column 2, line 1; also see Custodio, [0047] for binding between file ID and source file location).

As to claims 6, 14 and 22, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above to rejected claims 5, 13 and 21, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Custodio and Lee et al. teach:

“relating the data object to a context for an application server” (see Lee et al., [column 8, lines 1-12]).

As to claims 7, 15 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above to rejected claims 5, 13 and 21, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Custodio and Lee et al. teach:

“resolving the application-based name to a previously bound data object” (see Lee et al., [column 2, line 2]).

As to claims 8, 16 and 24, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above to rejected claims 1, 9 and 17, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Custodio and Lee et al. teach:

“wherein an application comprises a plurality of application modules, wherein each module is associated with a module name, and wherein each module is associated with an application-based name based on its module name” (see Custodio, [0037]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC
Art Unit 2164
January 8, 2008


CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER